



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/052,250

01/23/2002

Russell T. Davis

7643.0042

1920

22852

7590

08/16/2006

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP

901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	-Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/052,250	DAVIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chau Nguyen	2176	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) William Bashore, Chau Nguyen (USPTO). (3) ____.
- (2) Jeffrey Berkowitz, Paul Gurzo (Applicant's representative). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 14 August 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 62.

Identification of prior art discussed: Prior art of record (Krug, Polizzi).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The invention was discussed in light of the prior art of record. Examiner suggested amendments to further classify the "software element" found in the claims. Also, please verify in the specification where and how "software element" is interpreted as claimed. No formal agreement was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Chau Nguyen

Examiner's signature, if required